UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,839	05/13/2005	Kyoung-II Seo	038779/291940	8968
826 ALSTON & BI	7590 10/26/200 RD LLP	EXAMINER		
BANK OF AM	ERICA PLAZA	NILANONT, YOUPAPORN		
	RYON STREET, SUIT NC 28280-4000	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2446		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/534,839	SEO ET AL.	
E		
Examiner	Art Unit	

	YOUPAPORN NILANONT	2446					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 09 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the AMENIAN. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beta appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a content of the content of the	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying t					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, ,						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 1-21. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached information Displaceurs Statement(a) 			ce because:				
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	۳۱ ن کهانه) Paper No(s). <u>10-07-20</u>	<u>ภกล</u>					
/Jeffrey Pwu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

With respect to the claim objections, the applicant's amendments seem to fix the misprint and grammatical error in the claims and therefore the objections are withdrawn.

With respect to the art rejection, examiner is not persuaded.

Ronneke's invention discloses a system with separate computing resource that provides collection of billing data on a per-packet basis to each mobile subcriber (Ronneke, column 1 lines 65-67, column 2 lines 20-29). Thus, the authentication, ciphering and identification check done for each mobile stations are implicitly done before communication is allowed on the network provider's resource in order to correctly bill the subscriber per actual packet being communicated through the network.

Ronneke specification states that its invention is used with existing packet data network (Ronneke, column 2 lines 52-56) and that its nodes includes functionality like routers (Ronneke, column 4 lines 1-4). Though Ronneke recites insufficiency of convention IP routers, it recites insufficiency in the share computer resource for billing and traffic functions rather than the insufficiency of data collection. Further, Ronneke's citation of insufficiency would further encourage one of ordinary skill in the art to improve Mimura's disclosure with Ronneke's teaching in order to adapt to the growing mobile data servic market.

Furthermore, Ronneke is cited to be combined with Mimura to improve on known elements. Mimura is cited to teach the first resource that processes packet traffic and Ronneke's teaching will add to Mimura teaching. Additionally, Ronneke does not explicitly claim that the separate resources must be in separate devices.